

EXHIBIT G

to

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Civil Action No.: 1:10-cv-00986-JFA

Peer Review Reports

SCORING

Standard of Care

- 1 Good quality of care-Appropriate, no issue with the physician care
- 2 Documentation deficiencies
 - a. No issue with physician documentation
 - b. Does not substantiate clinical course, treatment and plan of care
 - c. Not timely to communicate with other care givers
 - d. Unreadable
 - e. Other
- 3 Care varied from best practice
Controversial-no major issues, varies from best practice
- 4 Care varied from best practice-no patient harm
Controversial-care varied from best practice: no patient harm
- 5 Care varied from best practice
Controversial-care varied from best practice: could harm patient
- 6 Care varied from best practice - did harm patient
 - a. Minor adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - b. Major adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - c. Catastrophic adverse outcome (death)

Disposition/Recommendation

- 1 Send letter
- 2 Refer to committee
- 3 Refer to MEC
- 4 Refer to External Peer Review
- 5 Other recommendation
- 6 Trend
- 7 No action required

Delay of ~ 2 hours in performing C-Section for abortion. Terbutaline contraindicated

Reported to Dr Robinson and recommended 2nd review.

Addendum A

C. Robinson 2-24-10 130pm

**CONFIDENTIAL
MEDICAL PEER REVIEW
DO NOT PHOTOCOPY**

CONFIDENTIAL
Peer Review Material

ARMC / MM 00001

SCORING

Standard of Care

- 1 Good quality of care-Appropriate, no issue with the physician care
- 2 Documentation deficiencies
 - a. No issue with physician documentation
 - b. Does not substantiate clinical course, treatment and plan of care
 - c. Not timely to communicate with other care givers
 - d. Unreadable
 - e. Other
- 3 Care varied from best practice
Controversial-no major issues, varies from best practice
- 4 Care varied from best practice-no patient harm
Controversial-care varied from best practice: no patient harm
- 5 Care varied from best practice
Controversial-care varied from best practice: could harm patient
- 6 Care varied from best practice - did harm patient
 - a. Minor adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - b. Major adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - c. Catastrophic adverse outcome (death)

Disposition/Recommendation

- 1 Send letter
- 2 Refer to committee
- 3 Refer to MEC
- 4 Refer to External Peer Review
- 5 Other recommendation : SUSPEND SUMMARY.
- 6 Trend
- 7 No action required

Addendum A

Minto
2/24/10

CONFIDENTIAL
MEDICAL PEER REVIEW
DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

CONFIDENTIAL
Peer Review Material

ARMC/MM 00002

Presentation 1150 Delivery 1411.

CONFIDENTIAL
MEDICAL PEER REVIEW
DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

Why did MD leave unit with maternal
pain, decels, no impr. despite
resuscitation measures.

"Abrupt clinical diagnosis"

Type of Incision: did surgeon recognize
urgency prior. If so why
Pfannestel. If no recognition
why not?

CHOICE OF ANESTHESIA: SPINAL why NOT GENERAL
How does OB know about "brain stem"?

Pathology: how is there deterioration of skin
with heart rate ~~be~~ on admission?
Peds noted cyanosis not "deterioration"

CORRECT Nursing record found clear / or report bloody

Nurses recognized need for C-section.
was this relayed and why MD
Did not MP.

ARMC/MM 00003

Suspend - Summary Immediate due to
concern over patient safety

Mult